



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Physical Science International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_29206
Title of the Manuscript:	Criticality Study for Large Masses of Low Enriched Uranium Samples in an Active Well Neutron Coincidence Counter
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The polyethylene chemical formula is C_2H_4, not CH_4: please correct through the text - Have you performed any sensitive calculations in order to establish the optimal number of neutrons and/or cycles? 	<p>Done</p> <p>To find out the optimal number of histories and cycles several runs were performed and the results were checked against the relative standard deviation. The number was chosen such that the obtained relative error was always less than 0.25%. (The text was modified [lines 79, 80] to clarify this).</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pag. 7, line 224-225: the system becomes again subcritical probably also due to the increase in neutrons capture by H - Please have a look to some typo errors through the text - In tab. 3 0.63 should be 0.63 	<p>Text amended to reflect this comment (lines 272, 273).</p> <p>Done</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		